

**Oroville Facilities Relicensing Program  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 2100  
Draft Summary of the Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting  
July 20, 2004**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on July 20, 2004 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Cultural Resource Work Group May 2004 Update
Attachment 4	Cultural Resource Work Group June 2004 Update
Attachment 5	Archaeological and Historic Site Inventory Report
Attachment 6	Historic Properties Management Report Presentation

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

### **Action Items – April 20, 2004 CRWG Meeting**

A summary of the April 2004 CRWG meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of the action item from that meeting as follows:

**Action Item #C69:** Distribute May 2004 Update.

**Status:** DWR distributed both May and June 2004 updates to the CRWG participants via mail. The updates are provided as Attachments 3 and 4, respectively.

### **Update on Studies in Progress**

Helen McCarthy with Far Western Anthropological Research Group (FWARG) informed the CRWG that ethnographic interviews are on-going and may extend through early fall. She also explained that they are moving into the evaluation interview stage, which involves examining various sites to determine if they are eligible for listing as a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP). She announced that they have identified 144 potential sites within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and noted that Appendix B to the Inventory Report contains another 243 sites located in the region beyond the APE. A participant asked if they are looking beyond the FERC boundary. Helen explained that the study area extends just beyond the boundary, adding that Appendix B describes the area of interest.

A participant asked if there is a potential for a TCP district landscape. Helen suggested it is too early to answer that because they have yet to complete the methodology to distinguish TCP sites. Helen said they are also relating the ethnographic studies to the archaeological studies.

Michael Delacorte with the California State University Sacramento (CSUS) reported on a presentation provided to the Maidu Advisory Council (MAC) on the proposed approach for the evaluation of a sample of prehistoric sites within the fluctuation zone. He told the CRWG that the MAC has expressed no concerns with the approach. Janis Offermann (DWR) offered to provide a copy of the presentation to those who would like it.

One participant asked how sites were selected for evaluation. Michael explained that some sites were selected because they fall within an area of on-going impacts while others were selected because they are representative of a specific site type. He added that the selection includes a range of different site types. All selected sites are on State lands and Michael noted that site BUT-84 has been taken out of consideration because of concerns that were expressed.

Adrian Praetzellis with the California State University Sonoma (SSU) provided copies of the public report on the Archaeology and Historic Site Inventory (Attachment 5) to the CRWG and Mark Selverston (SSU) presented a slideshow on the historic site evaluation. He reported that they have examined 30 historic resources and explained that they plan to examine another 34 sites before the end of 2004. The presentation highlighted the diversity of sites and links between them.

Adrian Praetzellis gave a power point presentation on the Draft Historic Properties Management Report (HPMP) (Attachment 6). He provided an overview of the development of the HPMP and explained that it will determine how properties will be treated for the life of the license. One participant asked how TCPs fit into the HPMP. Helen responded that they would first establish the values of the TCPs after which an example of an action included in the HPMP could involve Native American monitoring. One participant asked how topics brought up in the CRWG would be integrated into the HPMP. Janis said that the details have yet to be determined and suggested that any comments on the HPMP development be sent to her.

### **Next Meeting and Next Steps**

Janis told the CRWG that the historic evaluation and development of the HPMP is continuing concurrent with on-going settlement negotiations. She suggested the CRWG forego the next two meeting dates and meet next for an update on October 19. August and September updates would be distributed to the CRWG. The group agreed to next meet in October.

The next CRWG meeting is tentatively scheduled for:

Date: October 19, 2004

Time: 5:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

Location: To be determined.

**Action Item #C70:** Distribute an August and September update to CRWG participants.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: September/October 2004